

**Supporting Statement
A Survey of Livestock Producer Perceptions of Predators and Predator Damage
Management Methods
OMB Control Number 0579-XXXX**

Part B

B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods

1. Describe (including a numerical estimate) the potential respondent universe and any sampling or other respondent selection method to be used. Data on the number of entities (e.g., establishments, state and local government units, households, or persons) in the universe covered by the collection and in the corresponding sample are to be provided in tabular form for the universe as a whole and for each of the strata in the proposed sample. Indicate expected response rates for the collection as a whole. If the collection had been conducted previously, include the actual response rate achieved during the last collection.

The potential respondent universe of the Livestock Producer Perceptions of Predators and Predator Damage Management Methods study consists of livestock producers who 1) experienced livestock loss from predators, 2) worked with WS to try and mitigate losses, and 3) allowed WS State Directors to share their contact information within APHIS. On an annual basis, APHIS will administer the Predator Damage Management Questionnaire to approximately 200 respondents who meet these criteria with an expected response rate of about 46 percent or a minimum of 90 responses per year.

2. Describe the procedures for the collection of information including:

Statistical methodology for stratification and sample selection:

APHIS is expected to administer the Predator Damage Management Questionnaire to approximately 200 respondents annually. Our goal is to obtain a minimum of 90 completed responses from respondents who have received predator damage management services from WS Nonlethal Initiative programs and are located in one of the following 12 states: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, or Wyoming. Respondents will receive the Predator Damage Management Questionnaire every October, beginning in 2025.

Estimation procedure:

The Livestock Producer Perceptions of Predators and Predator Damage Management Methods study will be conducted using both an electronic and printed questionnaire. A sample of consenting respondents will be recruited from the target audience and asked to respond to questions regarding the effectiveness of predator damage management methods and their willingness to continue using such methods.

Degree of precision needed for the purpose described in the justification:

APHIS' goals are to produce reports and peer-review publications using descriptive statistics that will assist in improving WS Nonlethal Initiative programs and nonlethal predator damage management. Based on these statistical calculations, we will be able to summarize findings for livestock producers who received predator damage management services from the WS Nonlethal Initiative programs operating in the following 12 states: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, or Wyoming.

Unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures and data collection cycles:

There are no unusual problems requiring specialized sampling procedures and data collection cycles.

Any use of periodic (less frequent than annual) data collection cycles to reduce burden:

The data collection described is not planned to be carried out on a less than annual frequency basis.

3. Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied.

Questionnaire Design:

1. The Livestock Producer Perceptions of Predators and Predator Damage Management Methods study minimizes collection of data to that which is necessary to meet the stated objectives. The questionnaire was extensively reviewed by WS staff.
2. The investigators have made numerous efforts to identify the information needs of the WS Nonlethal Initiative and the best way to attain that information via questionnaire.
3. Skip logic is used in the electronic questionnaire to guide respondents to sections relative to their knowledge and avoid sections that would not be applicable or meaningful for the respondent.

Contacting Respondents:

APHIS is expected to email or mail the Predator Damage Management Questionnaire to approximately 200 respondents annually during the months of October through December. Our goal is to obtain a minimum of 90 completed responses each year from respondents

who have received predator damage management services from WS Nonlethal Initiative programs and are located in one of the 12 states (Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, or Wyoming). After the initial survey packet is emailed or mailed to respondents, nonrespondents will be sent three follow-up survey packets. The first follow-up packet will be sent a week after the initial survey packet. The second follow-up survey packet will then follow two weeks after the first, and the third follow-up survey packet will then follow two weeks after the second. If a respondent declines participation in the Livestock Producer Perceptions of Predators and Predator Damage Management Methods study by not responding, they will be asked to return APHIS either a nonresponse email or nonresponse postcard. Respondents will receive the Predator Damage Management Pre-Survey Postcard starting in September 2025.

Nonresponse adjustment:

APHIS will be conducting a nonresponse check with respondents who do not complete the Predator Damage Management Questionnaire. The nonresponse check will be conducted via a nonresponse email or a nonresponse postcard (depending on the respondent's provided method of contact). The 2 items included in the nonresponse check relate to perceptions of nonlethal predator damage management assistance rendered by WS. APHIS will compare respondents to nonrespondents using a t-test on the 2 items included in the nonresponse check. If there are no differences in responses to the selection of key survey questions between respondents and nonrespondents, there is no apparent evidence of nonresponse bias. However, if differences are found, those differences will be described, and limitations will be noted. APHIS is expecting approximately 41 responses annually to the Predator Damage Management Nonresponse Email and Predator Damage Management Nonresponse Postcard.

Weight adjustment:

The Livestock Producer Perceptions of Predators and Predator Damage Management Methods study is estimated to receive about 90 responses annually. Thus, weighing the data will not likely be statistically feasible.

Sampling and design strategies:

APHIS will administer the Predator Damage Management Questionnaire to respondents with an expected response rate of 46 percent or a minimum of 90 responses per year. A list of respondents will be provided to the APHIS WS National Wildlife Research Center (NWRC) Human Dimensions Unit by WS field staff or WS State Directors on an annual basis. These respondents will be livestock producers who 1) experienced livestock loss from predators, 2) worked with WS to try and mitigate losses, and 3) allowed WS State Directors to share their contact information within APHIS.

4. Describe any tests of procedures or methods to be undertaken. Testing is encouraged as an effective means of refining collections of information to minimize burden and improve

utility. Tests must be approved if they call for answers to identical questions from 10 or more respondents. A proposed test or set of tests may be submitted for approval separately or in combination with the main collection of information.

APHIS pretested the questionnaire with fewer than 10 respondents from members of the public and used the results of the pretest to refine the questionnaire to reduce respondent burden and improve the accuracy and usefulness of the information. The final questionnaire has been reviewed by the Human Dimensions Unit.

5. Provide the name and telephone number of individuals consulted on statistical aspects of the design and the name of the agency unit, contractor(s), grantee(s), or other person(s) who will actually collect and/or analyze the information for the agency.

The survey design and methodology as well as statistical aspects of the design were coordinated by:

- Dr. Keith Carlisle, Supervisory Social Scientist / Human Dimensions Unit Leader, NWRC, USDA, APHIS, WS, Fort Collins, CO (970-266-6047).
- Dr. Megan Cross, Social Scientist, NWRC, USDA, APHIS, WS, Fort Collins, CO (970-266-6366).
- Ms. Hailey Ellis, Research Social Scientist, NWRC, USDA, APHIS, WS, Fort Collins, CO (970-266-6148).
- Ms. Merrill Cook, Human Dimensions Specialist, NWRC, USDA, APHIS, WS, Fort Collins, CO (970-266-6044).

For a NASS review of the information collection request packet, Human Dimensions Unit coordinated with:

- Mr. Daniel Beckler, Chief, Standards and Survey Development Methodology Branch, USDA, NASS, Washington, DC (202-720-8858).
- Mr. Richard Hopper, Survey Statistician, Standards and Survey Development Methodology Branch, USDA, NASS, Washington, DC (202-720-2206).
- Mr. Jeffrey Hunt, Mathematical Statistician, Standards and Survey Development Methodology Branch, USDA, NASS, Washington, DC (202-720-5359).

Collection and analysis of the data will be accomplished by Human Dimensions Unit personnel reporting to:

- Dr. Keith Carlisle, Supervisory Social Scientist / Human Dimensions Unit Leader, NWRC, USDA, APHIS, WS, Fort Collins, CO (970-266-6047).